

THURSDAY, JULY 13, 2006

DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT DRAFT

The following action minutes are listed as they were acted upon by the Planning Commission and as listed on the agenda for the Regular Meeting of July 13, 2006 together with the maps and staff reports attached thereto and incorporated therein by reference.

PRESENT: Commissioners Sarah Christie, Bruce Gibson, Penny Rappa, Bob Roos and Chairperson Eugene Mehlschau

ABSENT: None

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE TO THE FLAG LED BY CHAIRPERSON MEHLSCHAU.

PUBLIC COMMENT

This is the time set for members of the public wishing to address the Commission on matters other than scheduled items.

Public Comment

Eric Greening: comments on the July 18, 2006 Board of Supervisors Agenda states there is a submittal to the Coastal Commission that will allow the county to move forward with the Cayucos and Rural Area of the Estero Area Plan, detaching them from Los Osos because of a lack of an approved habitat conservation plan, water supply and waste water issues.

Commissioner Roos: states an electric company was advertising they have dark sky compliant outside light fixtures for sale.

Planning Updates

Warren Hoag: Planning Staff, states there were no items of interest for the Planning Commission at the last Board of Supervisors hearing.

Matt Janssen: Planning, responds to Eric Greening's comment regarding the Estero Plan. He states the Planning Department will address all questions from the Coastal Commission and public at the Board of Supervisors hearing.

Commissioner Christie: asks if Cayucos and Los Osos are all part of the same Estero Planning Area. Will the county recall the entire submittal package from Coastal Commission.

Matt Janssen: Planning Staff, responds the county has submitted a full LCP amendment to the Coastal Commission that involves the urban areas of Cayucos and Los Osos including all the rural areas. At the Board of Supervisors hearing, Planning is requesting an endorsement to submit a replacement of the LCP amendment to the Coastal Commission that is the same but does not include Los Osos.

Commissioner Gibson: urges moving forward with the Estero plan.

Matt Janssen: Planning Staff, states Planning will address the new issues with the Board of Supervisors, but the goal is to move the plan forward.

James Caruso: Planning Staff, on August 1, 2005 there will be an authorization hearing at the Board of Supervisors to allow planning to start the revised conservation element of the General

Plan. This item is in the budget for 2006/2007. States he will be coming before Planning Commission with study sessions before the hearing process.

Commissioner Christie: asks about the status of the DiMaggo project in Cambria.

Warren Hoag: Planning Staff, the project was a Minor Use Permit heard last Friday by the Planning Department Hearing Officer and was approved. There is an appeal period locally and the Coastal Commission.

Consent:

- a. June 8, 2006 Planning Commission Minutes
- b. **TRACT 2513 (S030142U): 1st Time Extension Request** from **STEPHEN N. COOL AND CENTRAL CALIFORNIA INVESTMENTS** for a Vesting Tentative Tract Map and Conditional Use Permit to construct a planned development consisting of 7 single-family residences ranging in size from 1,148 to 1,285 square feet. In addition, seven parcels, ranging in size from 1,368 to 1,972 square feet are proposed with one parcel for common area totaling 6, 460 square feet. The project is located on the southwest side of Highway 101 Frontage Road, in the Nipomo urban area in the South County (Inland) planning area and in the Residential Multi-Family land use category. APN: 092-381-025. Supervisorial District #4.
- c. **TRACT 2514 (S030143U): 1st Time Extension Request** from **LORI NEWDOLL of NEWDOLL CONSTRUCTION, INC.** for a Vesting Tentative Tract Map and Conditional Use Permit to construct a planned development consisting of 7 single-family residences ranging in size from 1,148 to 1,285 square feet on seven parcels ranging in size from 1,368 to 1,756 square feet are proposed with one parcel for common area totaling 9,838 square feet. The project is located on the southwest side of the Highway 101 Frontage Road, in the Nipomo urban area in the South County (Inland) planning area and in the Residential Multi-Family land use category. APN: 092-381-025. Supervisorial District #4.

Thereafter, on motion of Commissioner Roos, seconded Commissioner Gibson and on the following vote:

AYES: Commissioners Roos, Gibson, Christie, Rappa and Chairperson Mehlschau

NOES:

commissioners approve consent agenda Items a thru c.

1. Hearing to consider a request by the **COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO** to amend the Land Use Element of the County General Plan (Salinas River Area Plan) and changes to the Land Use Ordinance, Title 22 of the County Code to allow changes to various land use categories and planning area standards within the community of San Miguel. The changes are intended to enable urban development and achieve consistency with the community vision within the community of San Miguel. The proposed project consists of amendments to eleven locations in the community of San Miguel, within the Salinas River Planning Area and modifications to Section 22.104.070 of Title 22 of the County Code. Also to be considered at the hearing will be approval of the Environmental Document prepared for the item. The Environmental Coordinator, after completion of the initial study, finds that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is not necessary. Therefore, a Negative Declaration (pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., and CA Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.) has been issued on June 8, 2006 for this project. Mitigation measures are proposed to address agricultural resources, air quality, biological

resources, cultural resources, geology and soils, public services/utilities, recreation, transportation and circulation, and water and are included as conditions of approval. **County File Number: LRP 2004-00026.** Assessor Parcel Numbers: Various. Supervisorial District: 1.

James Caruso: Planning Staff, presents staff report and shows overhead of the project. He discusses the San Miguel Community design goals and comments on the major issues associated with the proposed amendments.

Commission Members: discuss ownership of property; if property has been sold; rails for trails program; downtown corridor plan, limiting the use, with staff responding.

James Caruso: Planning Staff, discusses proposed land use category changes.

Commission Members: discuss existing land uses; proposed land use changes; the restriction of uses under Residential Multi Family; development uses in the strip next to the railroad; buffer between the railroad and road; size of lots; flood hazards and habitat issues; mixed uses.

James Caruso: Planning Staff, states it is a community based plan. The railroad goes through town and is concerned with rezone that will bring development closer to the tracks. County and rail safety staff met for a diagnostic review to address the issues of the railroad being located in town. County is committed as development occurs to fence or wall the railroad right of way except for the grated crossing at 11th and 14th Streets; trails along the Salinas River be required when property is developed and SB 18 concerns.

Commissioner Roos: discusses the changes to page 1-13 under Section 1, be corrected to read "Section 22.104.070(a)".

Commission Members: requests when staff updates the General Plan they include an insertion of a program to develop a common design railroad barrier for the community of San Miguel with staff responding county could include a standard that states a standard barrier design shall be approved by the Director of Planning and Building, with input from the San Miguel Advisory Committee, railroad, County Public Works and County Environmental Division prior to construction of the first portion of fencing or barrier.

Chuck Stevenson: Planning Staff, reads new language for 4b on Page 1-13: "A standard barrier design shall be approved by the Director of Planning and Building with input from the San Miguel Advisory Committee, railroad, County Public Works Department and the county Environmental Division prior to construction of any barrier fencing abutting the railroad property. Once approved all railroad safety barriers in San Miguel shall conform to this design."

Open to the Public

Dennis Deaheer: San Miguel Advisory Council, discusses the barrier issue. He discusses the Mission Street widening. States notification within 300 feet in the rural and agricultural area is not sufficient and would like the county to adopt a broader standard of 1000 feet. He comments on his concerns with items 10 and 11 and the difference in density between them.

Commission Members: discuss concerns regarding trail; fencing issues; improving commercial district; low income housing

Eric Greening: comments on his concerns regarding the Salinas River corridor, trails, safety hazards and railroad noise. He comments on Mr. Burch's response regarding SB18.

Michael Winn: Nipomo, discusses multi family housing. He asks if the railroad releases toilet waste along the railroad easement. He has concerns regarding zoning and parcel size. The units should be attached units with 0 lot-line setback between units.

Chuck Stevenson: Planning Staff, states the county can consider hedge rows as alternative fencing along the railroad, but that would require maintenance. The railroad has concerns with trespassing along the tracks.

James Caruso: Planning Staff, states when the railroad sells the land, they have a requirement that the owner must construct a barrier when they develop.

Commission Members: discusses types of barriers; and if owners of the lots are responsible for maintenance of the barriers.

Chuck Stevenson: Planning Staff, states the downtown street project is a 1 block project and will start later this year. States notifications are often sent to owners beyond 300 feet in rural areas.

James Caruso: Planning Staff, comments on the quiet zone and that the community can ask for it. States there are certain hours that the railroad can not sound their horn. Corrects the recommendation on page 1-1 to read: "Approval of the amendments to the Salinas River Area Plan, Part II of the Land Use Element and the Land Use Ordinance, as shown in the attached Exhibits LRP2004-00026:A, LRP2004-00026:B, based on the recommended findings listed in this report.

Commission Members: discuss EIR reviews; buffer along the railroad; impacts of the railroad; density of multi-family; proposed land use category changes; setbacks and uses; change of land use category for site 9 from industrial to open space and make it a dog park or community garden.

Dennis Deaheer: states there is one park in San Miguel and this strip would be a perfect park area.

Chuck Stevenson: Planning Staff, states it would be viewed by the railroad as taking their rights from them to sell the property. There are standards you could adopt limiting the uses.

Kami Griffin: Planning Staff, states the size is 50 and 70 feet wide and 1335 feet long. She gives reasons for not changing the strip to Open Space.

Tim McNulty: County Counsel, discusses allowable uses for open space.

Commission Members: discuss pulling Site 9; gives staff direction to evaluate Site 9 relative to over all value to the downtown; conflicts of commercial services across from residential and existing commercial services; uses allowed; community input; changing land use category to Open Space; staff crafting new language with the Advisory Council reviewing.

Kami Griffin: Planning Staff, discusses the addition of a new condition f4 in Exhibit LRP2004-00026:B as read into the record: 4. "Minimum Density" "A minimum density of 20 units per acres is required unless a higher density can be designed consistent with the standards of the land use ordinance and consistent with the allowed density in Section 22.10.130."

Commission Members: discuss the location of units in the flood hazard area; density of 15 units per acre; residential single family not allowed; if TDC's applied density raised to 20 units per acre; noise issue; water concerns; language requiring attached units; height limit; including the Salinas Trail for site 10 and 11; affordable housing.

On motion of Commissioner Roos, seconded by Commissioner Rappa and unanimously carried, the Commission continues this hearing to September 28, 2006.

2. Hearing to consider a request by the **COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO** for amendments to Land Use Ordinance Sections 22.06.030, 22.102.060, 22.104.080, 22.104.090, 22.106.020, 22.106.050, 22.108.030, 22.112.040 and 22.30.470; Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance Sections 23.03.042, 23.08.014 and 23.08.169; Coastal Zone Framework for Planning, Chapter 6, Table 0 and San Luis Bay Coastal Planning Area, Avila Beach Urban Area Standards and Avila Beach Rural Area Standards. This project is exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) under Section 15282(i) of the CEQA Guidelines. The proposed changes relate to bringing the standards into compliance with state law and amending the design and performance standards associated with the establishment of secondary dwellings. The changes will apply countywide. **County File Number: G030002L.** Assessor Parcel Number: Countywide. Supervisorial District: All

John Busselle: Planning Staff, presents staff report regarding secondary dwellings and shows overhead of the project. He discusses occupancy, access, parking, design, garage size, 2nd unit size, distance, minimum parcel size. He discusses jurisdiction reviewed from surrounding counties, Santa Barbara, Ventura, Kern, and Monterey. Proposed changes include: 1) access would require paved road for projects over 6000 sq ft and chip seal over class II road base for over 1 acre 2) parking -1 parking space per bedroom, with max of 2 spaces. 3) Size of attached garage proposed as 50% of 2nd dwelling floor area or max of 600 sq ft.

Commission Members: discusses size of garage; requirement of garage be attached to the secondary dwelling; size of seconded unit; impacts created from 2nd dwellings; distance from primary unit.

Roberta Hair: states she lives on Serpa Ranch Road, and the maximum allowable is 1 single family residence unless built before 1996. She requests a waiver to allow her to update her secondary dwelling unit.

Randy Newby: owns property on Serpa Ranch Road. He has concerns that he will not have the ability to update existing secondary residence.

Cindy Lewis: Wallace Group, states she supports affordable housing. She has concerns with attached garages.

Commission Members: discuss concerns regarding replacement of an existing secondary dwelling with staff responding.

Eric Greening: concerns over the size of 2nd dwelling because of traffic, air quality and local circulation issues. He requests an EIR.

Recess for lunch and the Commission reconvenes at 1:30 p.m.

John Busselle: discusses revision to table regarding size of units on different parcels.

Commission Members: discuss the increase of cars with larger units; increase of density; size of secondary unit; loss of resources in sensitive areas.

John Busselle: Planning Staff, responds there will be Environmental Review if project is located in sensitive areas.

Kami Griffin: Planning Staff, states a drainage plan requires CEQA review.

Commission Members: discusses changes to table on Page 2-10 and agrees with the change of maximum size of unit to be 640 square feet for lots that are 6000 square feet to 1 acre and 1 acre to

2 acres; maximum size of unit to be 800 square feet for lots 2 acres to 5 acres and 5 acres or more; add crossed out language F1(c) from page 2-9 regarding the entrance for secondary dwellings to #3 at the bottom of page 2-10; add "provided that no more than 50 percent of the site shall be covered by structures"

On motion of Commissioner Rappa, seconded by Commissioner Gibson and on the following roll call vote:

AYES: Commissioners Rappa, Gibson and Christie

NOES: Commissioners Roos and Chairperson Mehlschau

recommend to the Board of Supervisors approval of this general plan amendment as shown in the attached Exhibits G030003L:A, B and C based on the recommended findings contained in this report with changes to the Residential Secondary Dwellings table on page 2-10; the crossed out language in F1(c) from Page 2-9 added to F3 on Page 2-10; add to bottom of page 2-10 "provided that no more than 50 percent of the site shall be covered by structures".

3. Continued hearing to consider a request by the **COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO** to amend Section 22.22.080 of the Land Use Ordinance (Title 22) of the County Code and amend Section 23.04.028(d) of the Coastal Zone Land Use Ordinance (Title 23) of the County Code to modify the County's standards to convert existing residential development into a condominium, planned development or similar residential unit ownership. This ordinance amendment affects all planning areas and land use categories of the county that are outside of the jurisdictions of the incorporated cities. Also to be considered at the hearing will be approval of the Environmental Document prepared for the item. The Environmental Coordinator, after completion of the initial study, finds that there is no substantial evidence that the project may have a significant effect on the environment, and the preparation of an Environmental Impact Report is not necessary. Therefore, a Negative Declaration (pursuant to Public Resources Code Section 21000 et seq., and CA Code of Regulations Section 15000 et seq.) has been issued on April 27, 2006 for this project. Continued from June 22, 2006. **County File No: LRP2005-00009:A & B.** Assessor Parcel Number: Countywide. Supervisorial District: All

Ted Bench: Planning Staff, presents staff report and shows overhead of the project. He summarizes activities. Commission gave direction to staff to link ordinance to affordable housing policies, link permit conditions to impact report, require some affordable units, reconsider new Condition 5b regarding special needs tenants identified in the impact report. A new Condition 5a added regarding having 20% of units affordable to low/moderate income buyers or renters. He discusses consideration of annual 50% restriction on condominium conversions or the option of a "three year average", limit to 50% of rental units built over last 3 years. He discusses the advantage and disadvantage of the two programs. Discusses change to 3c(8) adding "where required" in last sentence after "*State Department of Real Estate*"; new 3c(9) added to read: "Where a public report is not required, the developer or applicant shall provide each tenant with a ninety (90) day period in which they have the first right to buy their unit at the same price offered to the public. The ninety (90) day period starts the day the final map records." He discusses changes to Exhibit LRP2005-00009:A Item E on page 1 and Item 6a on page 5 and Exhibit LRP 2005-00009B, page 1, item E and page 5, item 6 to read: "*The standards in this Subsection apply to the conversion of an existing residential or nonresidential development into a residential condominium, planned development, stock cooperative or similar residential unit ownership. All conversions shall comply with the California Subdivision Map Act and Title 21 of the County Code in addition to the standards of this Subsection.*"

Commission Members: discuss the amount of units allowed; nonresidential development.

Cindy Lewis: comments on letter commissioners received from John Wallace and states condos provide rental units. Discusses 3 year average and suggests rolling over the prior years unused credits into the next year.

Linde Owen: discusses condition 5 regarding low/moderate income provided lifetime lease or 1 year rental agreement. There is a shortage of affordable housing. Need to maintain affordable rental units.

Giselle Naylor: comments on concerns with the conversion ordinance.

Michael Winn: states he attended all of the workshops in 2004 and 2005. He urges the commission to say no. He states we need rentals in this county. Businesses are moving to Arizona and other states because of the lack of housing. Additional costs are not all included in your report. There will be new hook up fees and supplemental water.

Alon Pgrlman: states the ordinance increases the failure of the goal of affordable housing. The elderly will benefit from the ordinance. Instead of lifetime lease, it could be a 5 year lease.

Commissioner Roos: comments on his concerns with 5a on page 3 regarding only 20% of the total number of units being rented or sold to low or moderate income households. He supports more rental units. He discusses his concerns with 5b1 on page 3 regarding tenants 60 years or older. States there should be an income amount. Also has a concern with lifetime leases.

Commissioner Christie: states staff did a great job addressing concerns. She does not see the word affordable in the ordinance and feels the county will lose existing affordable housing stock. Can support ordinance if 100% of the condo's are title restricted as affordable.

Commissioner Rappa: would prefer to remove nonresidential from the ordinance. Supports low income not moderate income. She is not sure about the lifetime lease.

Commissioner Gibson: asks who benefits from the conversion. He discusses the subdivision map act. He discusses linking the impact report and conditions that are attached to the subdivision. States he does not want to lose housing affordability.

Tim McNulty: County Counsel, comments on page 5, 6a stating there may be a way to implement language regarding linking the impact report and conditions with the recordation of the map.

Commission Members: discuss banning condo conversion outright; condos being affordable for the moderate income household; deed restrict condo conversions, with staff responding.

On motion of Commissioner Christie, seconded by Commissioner Gibson, fails on the following roll call vote:

AYES: Commissioner Christie

NOES: Commissioners Gibson, Rappa, Roos and Chairman Mehlschau

to amended draft ordinance to ban condominium conversions and continue item with direction for staff to bring back appropriate findings and conditions.

Commissioner Gibson: does not support a ban on condos, but would support a deed restriction.

On a tentative motion of Commissioner Roos, seconded by Commissioner Rappa to allow 25% of construction from previous year, no deed restrictions, rent subsidy for low income and no lifetime lease discussed.

Commissioner Christie: states she can not support motion because the seniors will be displaced.

Matter is fully discussed and thereafter, motion maker and second amend their motion, and on motion of Commissioner Roos, seconded by Commissioner Rappa, and on the following roll call vote:

AYES: Commissioners Roos, Rappa, Gibson, Christie and Chairman Mehlschau

NOES:

the Commission continues this item to September 28, 2006 with staff directed to bring back changes to include: limit conversion to 25% of rental units with no carryover or three year average; tentative Tract Map in process waiting to accumulate the necessary credits to continue conversion; 25% deed restriction on converted units for low and very low income; rent subsidy for low and very low income and options regarding the lifetime lease.

4. Hearing to consider a request by the **COUNTY OF SAN LUIS OBISPO** to amend the County's General Plan by adopting a Parks and Recreation Element (PRE) and rescinding the 1968 Recreation Element, the 1991 Trails Plan, and the 1988 Parks and Recreation Master Plan. In addition, related amendments are proposed for the Framework for Planning, the Agriculture and Open Space Element, various Area Plans and the County Land Use Ordinance, Title 22 of the County Code, as they relate to parks and recreation. The PRE proposes policies and programs to acquire, develop, and maintain parks, recreation and special places within San Luis Obispo County. It is a major tool for identifying existing and future parkland, recreation, and natural areas. Also to be considered is the Final Environmental Impact Report (FEIR) prepared for the proposed project. The FEIR evaluates the environmental consequences of implementing the policies, programs and standards proposed in the PRE update and identifies mitigation for environmental effects that are considered avoidable. The issues addressed in the FEIR include: consistency with locally adopted plans and policies; public services; hydrology and water quality; geology and seismicity; biological resources; cultural resources; and other issues. The FEIR also evaluates cumulative effects, growth inducement and alternatives to the proposed update.
County File Number: LRP2005-00015. Supervisorial District: All

Commissioner Mehlschau: states after the last study session he discovered he has a conflict of interest because there is a trail proposed by his property. He called Fair Practice Board and they said if the trail is within 500 feet of his property there is a conflict of interest. He states there are 4 members who may have conflict of interests because of proposed or existing trails adjacent to their property.

Tim McNulty: County Counsel, spoke to Fair Practice Board and states if the trails are adjacent or 500 feet from property you own there may be a conflict of interest. He states Government Code 87100 prohibits public officials making or participating in making or otherwise using their position to influence governmental decisions in which they have a financial interest. If it is an indirect effect and does not have financial effect on property they can hear the issue. There is an exception in the Political Reform Act for General Plan Amendment that if you meet certain criteria the effect is considered to be indirect and all four must apply: (1) Decision only identifies planning objectives or as other wise exclusively one of policies; (2) The decision requires further decisions of the public official agency prior to implementing the policy; (3) The decision does not concern identifiable parcels; (4) The decision does not concern the agency's approval or change to a permit, license, zoning, land use ordinance or specific plan. Discuss the use of the Public General Exception and states this exception applies when the decision affects 10% more of all the property owners in the jurisdiction of the agency or 10 % or more of all the property owners in the district a commissioner represents or it affects 5000 property owners in the entire county.

Jan DiLeo: Parks Planner, asks if she should notice for the August 10 Planning Commission hearing. Discusses proposed planning commission review methodology. She presents staff report and shows overhead of the project. She states they will provide a brief background. The PRE would consolidate Park Division documents. Table is existing parks and facilities. If the commissioners have any grammar and spelling typos please send to her. Staff will log all proposed grammar changes, pulled items and proposed changes and direction to staff. Chapter 1; a brief indication of the importance of parks and recreation, history of San Luis Obispo County Parks as an agency, the vision, background/legal aspects of the PRE.

Eric Greening: states he has the support of ECO SLO. Asks about the availability of the draft EIR.

Chris Clark: states there are two documents, the Draft Environmental Impact Report and the final Environmental Impact Report that incorporates the draft by references and includes the comments received on the EIR; responds to the comments and mitigation monitoring program. It will be available on the web after Monday.

On motion of Commissioner Roos, seconded by Commissioner Gibson, and unanimously carried, tentative approval of Chapter 1.

COMMISSIONER RAPPA RECUSES HERSELF DUE TO POSSIBLE CONFLICT OF INTEREST AND STEPS DOWN.

Jan DiLeo: Parks Planner, discusses Chapter 2 value and benefits of parks. She discusses key issues: 1) parks have many benefits; 2) different parks play different roles; 3) size affects recreation and maintenance; most San Luis Obispo County neighborhood and community parks are undersized - per the NRPA guidelines; 4) open space is called a Nature Area, and is not a park, and has a different purpose.

Eric Greening: comments on page 7 of the Parks and Recreation Element regarding obesity and would like more recent information. He states on page 8 last sentence he is glad there is mention of alternative modes of transportation. Has a concern on page 16, last paragraph regarding traditional target acreages for parks are not realistic given funding limitations. Comments on page 19 2.2 (6) regarding steep slopes. He comments on page 20 2.5 regarding encouraging private development of parklands and facilities.

Commission Members: Page 7, discuss new information regarding obesity, with Commissioner Christie to provide the information; linear parks; page 13 regarding the Jim Green Trail; page 16 tentatively delete the sentence in last paragraph *"In practical terms, traditional target acreages for parks are not realistic given funding limitations"*; on page 16 they discussed the 1983 National Recreation and Park Association Standards for Parks and in 2 paragraph tentatively delete *"For example, 2005 population for the county would require the immediate acquisition and development of an additional 2,700 acres of local and regional parkland based on traditional park planning standards"*; discuss goal standards; adding a target for the life of the plan based on the proposed project in Appendix A; page 19 in OBJECTIVE A: in third line change *"Appendix A"* to *"Chapter 8"*; page 19 2.2(6), delete *"(such as steep slopes or toxic wastes)"*; page 19, change last sentence to read: *"In general, projects that do meet these criteria should receive a high priority or not be accepted by the County"*.

On motion of Commissioner Roos, seconded by Commissioner Gibson and carried with Commissioner Rappa absent; tentative approval of Chapter 2 with changes to Page 7, with staff directed to provide more recent information regarding obesity, page 16 tentatively delete the sentence in last paragraph *"In practical terms, traditional target acreages for parks are not realistic given funding limitations"*; page 16, second paragraph tentatively delete *"For example, 2005 population for the county would require the immediate acquisition and development of an additional 2,700 acres of local and regional parkland based on*

traditional park planning standards"; adding a target for the life of the plan based on the proposed project; page 19 in OBJECTIVE A: in third line change "*Appendix A*" to "*Chapter 8*"; page 19, 2.2(6), delete "*(such as steep slopes or toxic wastes)*"; page 19, change last sentence to read: "*In general, projects that meet these criteria will be given a high priority*".

COMMISSIONER RAPPA IS NOW PRESENT

On motion of Commissioner Roos and seconded by Commissioner Gibson and unanimously carried to continue this item to July 27, 2006.

On motion of Commissioner Roos and seconded by Commissioner Gibson and unanimously carried to take into the record all documents submitted today.

There being no further business, the meeting is adjourned at 5:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,

Eleanor Porter, Secretary
County Planning Commission